

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-11, 13-20, 22-24 and 28-36 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 11, 13, 14, 19, 24, 29-30, 34 and 35 are amended and claims 8, 12, 21, 25-27, 37 and 38 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance; (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, the above amendments incorporate features of dependent claims into independent claims. For example, independent claim 1 is amended to include features of dependent claims 8 and 9, independent claim 14 is amended to include features of dependent claim 21, independent claim 24 is amended to include features of dependent claims 25-27 and independent claim 35 is amended to include features of dependent claims 37 and 38. Because subject matter of dependent claims has been previously searched, no new issues are raised by these amendments. Entry is thus proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Office Action rejects claims 14, 16-18 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by U.S. Patent 5,835,641 to Sotoda et al. (hereafter Sotoda). The Office Action also rejects claims 1, 4-13, 15, 19-20 and 24-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sotoda in view of newly-cited U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0122121 to Fujii et al. (hereafter Fujii). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Reply to Office Action dated December 22, 2008

Independent claim 1 recites searching a center search line of a photographic screen, wherein the center search line comprises a horizontal axis at an approximate center of the photographic screen, searching an upper search line from the center search line and searching a lower search line from the center search line. Independent claim 1 also recites extracting a color average value and a deviation of a photographic object within the photographic screen for each of the upper search line and the lower search line, determining a size of photographic object based on the extracted color average value and the extracted deviation for each of the upper search line and the lower search line, and setting a zoom ratio by comparing the determined size of the photographic object with a reference value or with a preset size.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1, which may include features from previous dependent claims 8 and 9. More specifically, the Office Action cites Sotoda's FIGs. 11 and 16 and col. 12, line 49-col. 15, line 6 as teaching extracting a color average value and a deviation of a photographic object within the photographic screen. However, Sotoda does not teach or suggest determining a size of photographic object based on the extracted color average value and the extracted deviation for each of the upper line and the lower line.

The Office Action also cites various sections as teaching setting a zoom ratio. However, Sotoda does not teach or suggest setting a zoom ratio by comparing the determined size of the photographic object with a reference value or with a preset size.

Reply to Office Action dated December 22, 2008

Additionally, the Office Action states (on pages 6 and 8) that Fujii's FIGs. 17-27 and 29-30 discloses searching a center search line of a photographic screen wherein the center search line comprises a horizontal axis including an approximate center of the photographic screen. Fujii merely discloses a cursor CR that corresponds to a focused point on an LCD 10. See paragraph [0052]. A cursor display position control unit 211g may alter the display position of the AF cursor CR on the LCD 10. See paragraphs [0100]-[0101]. This does not teach or suggest searching a center search line of a photographic screen, wherein the center search line comprises a horizontal axis at an approximate center of the photographic screen. The cursor CR does not teach or suggest a horizontal axis at an approximate center of the photographic screen.

For at least these reasons as set forth above, Sotoda and Fujii do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 14 recites searching a plurality of lines of a photographic screen by alternatively searching lines with a pre-determined gap up or down one line by one line, and for each of the plurality of lines, extracting a color average value and a deviation of a photographic object on the photographic screen. Independent claim 14 also recites determining a size of a photographic object based on the extracted color average value and the extracted deviation for each of the plurality of lines, determining a zoom ratio by comparing the determined size of the photographic object and a reference value, and applying the determined zoom ratio to the photographic object.

Reply to Office Action dated December 22, 2008

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Sotoda and Fujii do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 14, which may include features from previous dependent claim 21. More specifically, Sotoda and Fujii do not teach or suggest determining a zoom ratio by comparing the determined size of the photographic object and a reference value. The Office Action (on page 4) also states that Sotoda's FIGs. 12a-12b teach alternatively searching lines with a predetermined gap up and down one line by one line. This does not teach or suggest searching a plurality of lines of a photographic screen by alternatively searching lines with a pre-determined gap up or down one line by one line. This also does not suggest any type of predetermined gap up or down one line by one line. Thus, independent claim 14 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 24 recites searching a center search line of a photographic screen to detect a photographic object, wherein the center search line is approximately at a center of the photographic screen. Independent claim 24 also recites searching an upper search line of the center search line to extract an average value and a deviation of a skin color of the photographic object, searching a lower search line of the center search line to extract an average value and a deviation of a skin color of the photographic object, and determining a size of a face region based on the extracted average value and the extracted deviation of the skin color for the upper search line and based on the extracted average value and the extracted deviation of the skin color for the lower search line. Still further, independent claim 24 recites comparing the determined

Reply to Office Action dated December 22, 2008

size of the face region with a reference value, calculating a zoom ratio based on the comparing, and applying the calculated zoom ratio to the photographic screen.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Sotoda and Fujii do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 24, which may include features from previous dependent claims 25-27. More specifically, Sotoda and Fujii do not teach or suggest comparing the determined size of the face region with a reference value, calculating a zoom ratio based on the comparing, and applying the calculated zoom ratio to the photographic screen. Sotoda and Fujii also do not teach or suggest searching a center search line of a photographic screen to detect a photographic object, wherein the center search line is approximately at a center of the photographic screen. Thus, independent claim 24 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 35 recites searching a center search line of a photographic screen to detect text, determining an average value of a stroke thickness of the text by searching upper and lower search lines of the photographic screen, and determining a size of the text based on the determined average value of the stroke thickness of the text. Independent claim 35 also recites comparing the determined size of the text with a reference value, calculating a zoom ratio based on the comparing, and applying the calculated zoom ratio to the photographic screen.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Sotoda and Fujii do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 35, which may include features from dependent claims 37-38. More specifically, Sotoda does not teach or suggest comparing the determined size of the text with a reference value, calculating a zoom ratio based on the comparing and applying the

Reply to Office Action dated December 22, 2008

calculated zoom ratio to the photographic screen. Sotoda also does not relate to detecting text, an average value of a stroke thickness of text, and/or a size of text. Thus, independent claim 35 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 14, 24 and 35 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

For example, dependent claim 10 recites searching the number of upper and lower search lines comprises performing a line-scanning, and searching lines set with a predetermined gap up and down one line by one line. Dependent claim 29 recites searching the upper search line and searching the lower search line comprises alternatively searching lines set with a predetermined gap up and down one line by one line. Sotoda and Fujii do not teach or suggest at least these features. Sotoda's FIGs. 12a-12b do not suggest alternatively searching lines set with a predetermined gap up and down one line by one line. Thus, dependent claims 10 and 29 define patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 4-7, 9-11, 13-20, 22-24 and 28-36 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would

Serial No. **10/731,025**

Docket No. **P-0614**

Reply to Office Action dated December 22, 2008

place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: March 4, 2009

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610